

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The final Office Action dated December 29, 2005, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 11-26 are withdrawn in this application. Claims 1-9 are rejected to by the Examiner. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 1-9 and 11-26 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Related Art (ARA) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,057,896 to Rho et al. (hereinafter “[Rho]”).

The rejection of claims 1-9 and 11-26 is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 1-9 are allowable over the cited references in that each of these claims recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a sixth conductive layer between and in contact with both the exposed portion of the third conductive layer and the fourth conductive layer, and between and in contact with both the first conductive layer and the fifth conductive layer.” None of the cited references including the ARA and Rho, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of the claimed invention.

In the Office Action, the Examiner admits that the “AAPA fails to specifically disclose a sixth conductive layer between the exposed portion of the third conductive layer and the fourth conductive layer, and between the first conductive layer and the fifth conductive layer.” (See Office Action, p. 3.) In order to cure this deficiency the examiner cites Rho stating: “Rho discloses an LCD having a sixth conductive layer (fig. 6, ref. 90, 31) between the exposed portion of the third conductive layer and the fourth conductive layer, and between the first conductive layer and the fifth conductive layer.” The drain electrode 90 is identified as the sixth conductive layer between the third conductive layer and the fourth conductive layer, but this drain electrode is not “between and in contact with both the exposed portion of the third conductive layer and the fourth conductive layer.” Further, Examiner identifies the metal pattern 31 in Rho as the sixth layer, and hence implies that the pixel electrode 140 and the storage capacitor electrode 30 are the fifth and first electrodes respectively. The metal pattern 31 is only

in contact with the pixel electrode 140 and not in contact with the storage capacitor electrode 30 as claimed. Accordingly claims 1-9 are allowable over ARA and Rho singly or in combination.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 28, 2006

By Eric J. Nuss
Eric J. Nuss
Registration No. 40,106

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant